

REMARKS

Applicant believes that the amendments to the claims as well as the comments that follow will convince the Examiner that the rejections provided in the September 2, 2009 Office Action have been overcome and should be withdrawn. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 12 and submits that the changes are supported by the specification. Applicant has submitted new claim 23. No new matter has been added.

I. THE EXAMINER'S REJECTIONS

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, and 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pugliese, et al., U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2001/0016825 (hereinafter "Pugliese") in view of Block, et al., U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0055689 (hereinafter "Block") and Rouston, et al., U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2001/0037243 (hereinafter "Rouston").

The Examiner states:

Pugliese teaches a method of providing automated reservations comprising the steps of: authenticating a user via a system (¶¶ 0011); authenticating said user utilizing one or more forms of identification data provided by said user to said system to access an awards account (¶¶ 0011, 74); acquiring itinerary data from said user (¶ 0067); querying an itinerary database with said itinerary data (¶¶ 0040, 0081); providing to said user a plurality of itineraries (¶ 0040); allowing said user to select an itinerary from said plurality of itineraries (¶ 0040); querying an awards database to determine if said user has sufficient awards in said awards account for an itinerary (¶¶ 0074-75); and acquiring payment information from said user for said selected itinerary (¶ 0040).

Pugliese does not teach that the system used to interact with a user is an automated interactive voice response system; which is taught by Block (¶ 0010). ...

While Pugliese teaches determining if said user has sufficient awards in said awards account for certain goods/services (¶¶ 0074-75), it does not explicitly teach determining if said user has sufficient awards in said

awards account for an itinerary; which is taught by Rouston (¶ 0035). (Office Action dated September 2, 2009, pp. 2-3) (emphasis in original).

The Examiner also rejected claims 2-5 and 7-10 as being unpatentable over Pugliese in view of Block and Rouston. (Office Action dated September 2, 2009, pp. 4-5). The Examiner also rejected claim 6 as being unpatentable over Pugliese in view of Block and Rouston and further in view of Trader et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,854,837 (hereinafter “Trader”). (Office Action dated September 2, 2009, p. 5). Further, the Examiner rejected claim 11 as being unpatentable over Pugliese in view of Block and Rouston and further in view of Lambert, et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,282,649 (hereinafter “Lambert”). (Office Action dated September 2, 2009, pp. 5-6). Finally, the Examiner rejected claims 12-22 as being unpatentable over the combinations of Pugliese, Block, Rouston, Trader and Lambert as applied against claims 1-11. (Office Action dated September 2, 2009, p. 6).

II. THE EXAMINER’S REJECTIONS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable under Pugliese in view of Block and Rouston. Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the claim elements of the present invention.

Applicant submits that the Pugliese, Block and Rouston references, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the limitations of claim 1 as amended. For example, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest the limitations of acquiring baggage data from a user and querying a baggage database for stored baggage information related to said baggage data.

Applicant submits that the Pugliese, Block and Rouston references, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the limitations of claim 12 as amended. For example, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest the limitations of prompting a user to enter baggage data, acquiring baggage data from the user and querying a baggage database with the baggage data for information in the baggage database.

Applicant respectfully submits that Pugliese, Block and Rouston do not individually or in combination disclose, teach or suggest the limitations required by independent claims 1, 12 and 23. Applicant's invention as defined by independent claims 1, 12 and 23 is not obviated by the references and is therefore in condition for allowance. Hence, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections.

III. CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that the specification, drawings, and all pending claims represent a patentable contribution to the art and are in condition for allowance. No new matter has been added. Early and favorable action is accordingly solicited.

Should any changes to the claims and/or specification be deemed necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned to discuss the same.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 2, 2010



David M. Hill
Reg. No. 46,170
WARD & OLIVO
380 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10017
(212) 697-6262